DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 443 SP 040 857

AUTHOR	Watzke, John L.
TITLE	Study of Stages of Beginning Teacher Development in a Field-Based Teacher Education Program.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	29p.; Study of Stages of Beginning Teacher Development in a Field-Based Teacher Education Program.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; *Developmental Stages; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Masters Degrees; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	University of Notre Dame IN

ABSTRACT

This study investigated stages of beginning teacher development within a field-based Master's of Education program that included a 4-semester, full-time teaching requirement in impoverished schools. The study examined stage theory in teacher development, comparing the literature with identified stages in this field-based programmatic model. It also identified characteristics of teacher development across 1.5 years of beginning teaching. Participants were first and second year teachers who completed surveys at the beginning and end of the summer session and end of one semester of teaching. The survey identified stages of teacher development and assessed the impact of programmatic goals. The study involved collecting demographic and background information and observing teachers. The chronology of beginning teacher characteristics suggested a dynamic process of initial concerns, experience, reflection, and professionalization. This sequence was inclusive of the self, task, and impact descriptors, but more varied in the application to development. Six stages included pre-teaching, post-practicum, initiation to teaching, professionalization, reflection, and professional growth. Impact concern was the highest ranking concern from beginning to end. Concerns for self were initially reduced upon the first year of teaching, but reemerged by the end of the first year. (Contains 10 tables and 27 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 443

Study of Stages of Beginning Teacher Development in a Field-Based Teacher Education Program

Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association,
April 1-5, 2002 New Orleans, LA

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John L. Watzke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

John L. Watzke, Ph.D.
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
jwatzke@nd.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

The overarching purpose of this study was to investigate stages of beginning teacher development within the context of a two-year field-based Master's of Education program. A central and unique component of this program is a four-semester full-time teaching requirement in under-resourced schools. Specifically, this research will serve three purposes. First, it will investigate stage theory in teacher development comparing the literature with identified stages in this field-based programmatic model. Second, it will identify the characteristics of teacher development across one and one-half years of beginning teaching. Third, it will provide feedback to the process of teacher supervision and preparation under this model. Finally, it will discuss the unique contributions such a programmatic model offers in the field of teacher preparation.

BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Notre Dame Master's of Education Program

The M.Ed. at the University of Notre Dame enrolls over 180 graduate student teacher candidates and graduates over 80 annually. This program offers the opportunity to study the development of beginning teachers within an innovative approach to teacher education. Traditional programs typically require students to complete a one- or two-semester practicum and student teaching sequence after completion of education coursework (Dadlez, 1998). As an alternative to this model, professional development schools have been explored as a means for combining education coursework within a field-based experience. The Notre Dame M.Ed. extends this concept into a model featuring a two-year and two-summer programmatic sequence of full-time teaching, study, mentoring and supervision based in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP040857

service to under-resourced schools. New teacher candidates complete an initial eight-week summer session before beginning their first year of full-time teaching in schools in 15 states across the southern United States. Between the first and second year of teaching, a second summer session is completed. Additional distance education coursework is completed during the two years of full-time teaching for a total of 44 graduate credits. The teacher candidates live together in groups of 4-8 in local co-educational cooperative homes where they participate in community outreach related to their school sites.

The Problem of Beginning Teaching: Stage Theory

Traditional models of teacher education have been criticized for a number of reasons: oversimplification of the realities of teaching, lack of adequate time for preparation and classroom experience, feelings of unpreparadness expressed by graduates (Bullough, 1990; Griffin; Jacknicke and Samiroden,1990; Kagan, 1992; Griffin, 1989; Lanier and Little, 1986). Research on teacher development identifies the first years of teaching as particularly problematic as teachers enter an initial stage of development. The primary problem cited by beginning teachers is classroom control. As McDonald and Elias (1980) note, "Beginning teachers apparently are unable to deal with educational problems of any kind until they feel they can teach a class without interruption, with reasonable attention from their students, and without receiving disrespectful or even insulting behavior from pupils" (p. 14). Teachers must be beyond this initial survival stage in order to focus on improved content instruction and its affect on student learning, achievement and needs. The Notre Dame programmatic model strives to provide optimal support during the first years of teaching. However, little is known about professional development in this model to inform mentoring and supervision.

Many researchers and theorists have posited developmental changes in teachers (Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1972; Fuller and Bown, 1975; Fuller, Parsons, and Watkins, 1974; George, 1978; Burden, 1981; Berliner, 1988). Stage theories focus on distinct points in development that are not related to a particular age. These developmental points are evident in teachers' ways of thinking. The thought patterns create a progression of development in a definite sequence, with one stage following the other. Fuller's "concerns theory" from the late 1960's forms the basis of much of this research. This theory was initially constructed through counseling seminars with novice teachers. "Concerns" can be defined as "the perceived problems of teachers" (Fuller, 1969), or "something he or she thinks about frequently and would like to do something about personally" (Reeves and Kazelskis, 1985, p.267-286). According to Fuller, all teachers go through "stages of concerns" which are reflective of a teacher's experience (see Figure 1) (Fuller, 1969). In a "pre-teaching" phase, prior to contact with actual classroom situations, teachers exhibit non-teaching concerns, such as where they would be placed for student teaching. The first stage of teaching is concern for *self* as reflected in such concerns as survival in the classroom, receiving good evaluations by administrators, acceptance by peers, and feelings of adequacy. The second

stage is concern about the teaching *task*, as revealed by concerns about the teaching situation (e.g. duties, materials, number of students), methods, and student performance. The third stage of concern is *impact* of teaching on pupils, indicated by concerns for meeting diverse student needs and adapting teaching methods to meet these needs. Fuller proposed that these concerns follow a hierarchical pattern; one moves up the levels by addressing and resolving perceived problems at each level. Fuller's concerns theory assumes that before a teacher can address the later concerns, the earlier concerns must be resolved.

The research base on stages of teacher development provides relatively consistent findings by researcher and study design. Some theorists posit more stages in between, but the essential progression remains the same: self-survival stage, task-instruction stage, impact-students stage. Fuller and Case (1971) initially devised an open-ended system of teacher concerns based on a series of questions. From this instrument, they developed the 56-item Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC) (Fuller & George, 1978). Subsequent studies by Fuller and others over the past thirty years have replicated these initial studies using the TCC to identify stages of teacher development in various instructional settings (Adams, 1982; Adams, Hutchinson, and Martray, 1980; Dadlez, 1998; Fuller and Case, 1971; Fuller, Parsons, and Watkins, 1974; George, 1978; George, Borich, and Fuller, 1974; Reeves and Kazelski, 1985; Kazelski and Reeves, 1987) and to establish the reliability of the TCC through statistical analysis (Lamanna, 1993; Schipull, 1990). The findings from these studies suggest the TCC is a reliable measure for the identification of stages of teacher development.

Numerous studies using research approaches and instruments other than the TCC have identified stages of teacher development and proposed theories similar to Fuller's (Berliner, 1988; Burden, 1981; Carter, 1990; Kagan, 1992; Katz, 1972; Odell, 1986). These theories are all very similar with regard to the concerns and problems faced by teachers at each stage. For example, theorists report teachers in the first or initial stage of teaching lack confidence and are concerned about classroom control. After moving beyond the first stage and into the second, all theorists describe teachers as concerned about enhancing their teaching skills. Finally, in the last or mature phase, all theorists cite teacher concerns about student learning. By making the content of a teacher education program congruent with teachers' developmental needs, teachers can more readily address their most salient concerns and problems (Fuller, 1971). This study will identify the needs and developmental progression of teachers specific to this unique M.Ed. programmatic model.

METHOD

Research Questions

The study was framed by the following research questions:

1. What stages of teacher development (ex. self-survival, task-instruction, and impact-students) are identifiable in a cross-sectional comparison of first- and second-year teachers?
2. Are the identified stages developmental in sequence (i.e. do they reflect the theoretical self, task, impact chronology?) in this field-based program?
3. What are the characteristics of stages across first- and second-year teacher cohorts?

Subjects

Subjects consisted of two cohorts of teachers representing a cross-sectional study of teacher development over one and one-half years of beginning teaching (see Table 1). The first-year teacher cohort (n = 82) was introduced into the study upon the beginning their first summers that would serve in partial preparation for full-time teaching. The second-year cohort (n = 76) was introduced into the study on the first day of their second summer session, after having completed a full summer session and a first year of teaching. The two cohorts were comparable by gender, ethnicity, undergraduate grade point average and prior years of previous experience in schools. The first-year cohort was a full year older on average and had a greater variety of experiences in schools prior to acceptance in the program. In particular, the first-year cohort had more prior experience as volunteers, in before- and after-school work, and as classroom aides. In terms of their full-time teaching context, the two cohorts were comparable (see Table 2). The majority of teachers (50.0%) taught in the grade 5-8 middle school range. Approximately 34% taught in the grade 9-12 high school range and the smallest proportion in the grade 1-4 elementary school range. The teachers taught predominantly in schools in urban settings. The minority percentage of the schools fell predominantly into two extreme categories — either 81-100% minority (approximately 40% for each cohort) or 0-20% (approximately 38% for each cohort). Most teachers taught in schools in which over half of the student population came from a minority population.

Instrument

The survey instrument was designed to identify stages of teacher development based on Fuller and Case's TCC and to assess the impact of programmatic goals. The survey consisted of three parts for a total of 88 items. It was initially piloted with recent graduates from the M.Ed. program. Part one (46 items) was based on an adaptation of the TCC (Dadlez, 1998; Schipull, 1990). It was designed to identify specific stages of teacher development based upon indicated levels of concern on various aspects of teaching via a five-level Likert scale (1 = not concerned to 5 = extremely concerned). Part two (30 items) was designed to identify the teacher candidates' level of agreement concerning the programmatic goals of

professional development, community involvement and spiritual growth on a five-level Likert scale. Part three (12 items) was designed to collect additional data on each teacher candidate's teaching situation and future plans with regard to education. Additional demographic and background information for each participant was collected from the records and transcripts collected and submitted for entrance into the M.Ed. program. The teachers wrote weekly electronic journal entries submitted on a web-based platform. Once a semester, a visit was made to each teaching site to observe the teachers and to meet with school personnel. The researcher completed a teaching observation form and took field notes based on observation and discussion with the teacher candidate, his/her mentor teacher, and the building principal. For the purposes of this study, only the first part of the survey instrument was used in data analysis.

Data Collection

Three applications and periods of data collection took place: at the beginning of the summer session; at end of a summer session; at the end of one semester of teaching. The first-year teacher cohort was new to the program when the first application was initiated. The second-year teacher cohort had completed their initial summer and one year of teaching upon the first application. Thus, a cross-sectional comparison was possible using these two cohorts of teacher candidate across three points in the sequence of the program to represent six total points across one and one-half years of beginning teaching.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis consisted of the following steps. To identify developmental stages, factor analysis (principal component with an extraction Eigenvalue of 1.0 and Varimax rotation) was conducted on the 46-items from part one of the survey for each of the six applications. This presented six models representing a chronology of development for further analysis. Next, a mean was computed for each factor in each of the six analyses to rank the factors. Each mean was represented by the mean of means of each variable associated with each factor. Finally, the means of factors for each application were ranked based on the results of analysis of variance. A one-way ANOVA was conducted on each set of factor means with Scheffé post-hoc tests in order to rank and establish unique groupings of factors according to strength of concern. These groupings represent those factor means which are statistically larger than the next lowest mean at the .05 level.

RESULTS

Tables 3-8 summarize the results of the factor analyses and the unique sub-groups formed by ANOVA for each of the six applications. The following summary reports those subgroups rated at the "moderately concerned" level or higher.

First-Year Teachers at the Beginning of First Summer Session

Table 3 presents the results of analysis of data collected at the beginning of the program, prior to the first summer session courses and practicum. Thirteen factors were identified and ranked into five unique subsets according to strength of concern.

- Subset 1 – Grouped three factors with means just above the "moderately concerned" level, which equally included self, task and impact concerns. These moderate concerns were for classroom management, student academic-emotional-personal growth, and professional appraisal and acceptance.
- Subset 2 – Grouped three factors with means just above the moderately "concerned" level, which equally included self, task and impact concerns. These concerns were for professional adequacy, instructional materials, and the academic range of students.
- Subset 3 – Grouped one factor with a mean just below the "moderately concerned" level, which included elements of task and impact concerns. This concern was for student personal-academic problems and the required curriculum.

First-Year Teachers at the End of the First Summer Session

Table 4 presents the results of analysis of data collected at the end of the first summer session, after completion of coursework and practicum. Ten factors were identified and ranked into four unique subsets according to strength of concern.

- Subset 1 – Grouped three factors with means just above the "moderately concerned" level, which included three elements of impact, one of self, and one of task concerns. These concerns were for student academic-emotional-personal growth, the academic range of students, student learning problems, professional growth, and instructional materials.
- Subset 2 – Grouped one factor with a means just above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on a task concern. This concern was for a lack of instructional materials.

First-Year Teachers at the Middle of the First Year of Teaching

Table 5 presents the results of analysis of data collected in the middle of the first year of teaching. Thirteen factors were identified and ranked into seven unique subsets according to strength of concern.

- Subset 1 – Grouped one factor with a mean well above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on an impact concern. This concern was for the academic range of students.
- Subset 2 – Grouped one factor with a mean well above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on an impact concern. This concern was for student academic-emotional-personal growth.
- Subset 3 – Grouped two factors with means just above or at the "moderately concerned" level, which included two task concerns. These concerns were for instructional materials and classroom management.

Second-Year Teachers at the Beginning of the Second Summer Session

Table 6 presents the results of analysis of data collected after completion of the first year of teaching, at the beginning of the second summer session. Twelve factors were identified and ranked into six unique subsets according to strength of concern.

- Subset 1 – Grouped two factors with means just towards the "very concerned" level, which included two impact and one self concern. These concerns were for student academic-emotional-personal growth, the diagnosing of student learning problems, and professional growth.
- Subset 2 – Grouped one factor with a mean just above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on a self concern. This concern was for professional adequacy.
- Subset 3 – Grouped one factor with a mean just below the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on one self and one task concern. These concerns were for classroom management and professional acceptance.

Second-Year Teachers at the End of the Second Summer Session

Table 7 presents the results of analysis of data collected at the end of the second summer session, after completion of coursework. Twelve factors were identified and ranked into five unique subsets according to strength of concern.

- Subset 1 – Grouped three factors with means well above the "moderately concerned" level and towards the "very concerned" level, which included three self and two impact concerns. These concerns were for student motivation, student academic-emotional-personal growth, professional growth, and professional adequacy.
- Subset 2 – Grouped one factor with a mean just above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on a task concern. This concern was for classroom management.

• Subset 3 – Grouped one factor with a mean just above the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on a task concern. This concern was for instructional materials.

Second-Year Teachers at the Middle of The Second Year of Teaching

Table 8 presents the results of analysis of data collected in the middle of the second year of teaching. Eleven factors were identified and ranked into seven unique subsets according to strength of concern.

• Subset 1 – Grouped two factors with means just above the "moderately concerned" level, which included two self and two impact concerns. These concerns were for student motivation and academic growth, student academic-emotional-personal growth, and professional growth.

• Subset 2 – Grouped one factor with a mean just below the "moderately concerned" level, which focused on a task concern. This concern was for non-instructional duties and instructional materials.

DISCUSSION

Debunking the Self-Task-Impact Developmental Chronology

Table 9 presents a summary of the number of self, task and impact concerns related to factors at each application with means at or above the "moderately concerned" level. The chronological development suggested runs opposite to that proposed by concerns theory. Although prior research has found a high level of concern for impact in new and experienced teachers (Dadlez; Schipull), this has not been the case in a number of studies investigating both pre-service teachers and novice teacher concerns. The results show a consistent presence and high ranking for concerns about the impact of teaching on students from initial entry into the M.Ed. program through the first year and one-half of teaching. In terms of moderate to very concerned ratings, self and task concerns varied across the six applications with self concerns becoming more numerous toward the middle of the second year of teaching. Thus, the proposed self-task-impact chronology was not supported by the results.

Chronological Characteristics of Development

The chronology of beginning teacher characteristics suggests a dynamic process of initial concerns, experience, reflection and professionalization. This sequence is inclusive of the self, task and impact descriptors, but more varied in their application to development. The following description of teacher development characteristics represents the studies' six applications and proposes stages based on the results (see Figure 2 for a summary of characteristics).

Pre-Teaching

Teachers' indicate moderate concerns related to all three stages. They are most concerned with classroom management and instructional materials, the academic range and personal growth of students, and professional adequacy and acceptance.

- Even distribution of moderately concerned factors across Self, Task and Impact
- "Classroom Management" was highest ranked concern (statistically even with "Student Academic-Emotional-Personal Growth" and "Performance Appraisal/Professional Acceptance")
- Additional factors related to instructional materials/curriculum and professional adequacy ranked high
- Personal involvement and acceptance by students and time factors such as number of students and non-instructional duties ranked last with means at the "a little concerned" level

Post Practicum

Teachers' indicate moderate concerns related to Impact: student academic range and academic, personal and emotional growth. Embedded within these impact concerns are issues of professional growth and instructional materials.

- Impact factors (three) were the highest ranked grouping at the "moderately concerned" level followed by task factors (three) related to inadequate instructional materials just below the "moderately concerned" level
- Self factors were embedded into impact or task factors and related to issues of "Professional Growth", "Pressure of Student Personal Involvement" and "Professional Freedom"
- "Non-Instructional Duties" continued to be ranked last with a mean just above the "a little concerned" level

Initiation to Teaching

Teachers' strongest concerns become more focused on impact and task. Concerns related to self drop to below the "moderately concerned" level. They show heightened concern, above the "moderately concerned" level, for student academic range and the academic-personal-emotional growth than in "pre-teaching" and "post-practicum." Additionally, there are moderate concerns for inadequate instructional materials and classroom management.

- Impact concerns were ranked higher than Task concerns
- The Impact factor concerns of "Student Academic Range" and "Student Academic-Emotional-Personal Growth" were strongest falling between the "moderate" to "very concerned" level
- The Task factor concerns of "Instructional Materials" and "Classroom Management" were the next strongest at the "moderately concerned" level
- Student issues with sexuality, drugs and learning problems ranked high.

- "Professional Adequacy" and "Professional Growth" linked to Task factors reemerged since pre-teaching with means near the "moderately concerned" level
- Acceptance by students as related to the appraisal of teacher performance ranked last with a mean at the "a little concerned" level

Professionalization

Impact concerns, such as student learning problems and student academic-emotional-personal growth, rise higher towards "very concerned" levels. However, teachers also indicate many concerns with the self issues of professional growth, adequacy and acceptance at or above the "moderately concerned" level. Classroom management continues to be a moderate concern.

- Impact and Self factors ranked highest; Self factors reemerged since the beginning and end of the first summer session
- The Impact factor concerns of "Student Academic-Emotional-Personal Growth" and "Diagnosing Student Learning Problems" were closest to the "very concerned" level
- The Self factor concerns of "Professional Growth", "Professional Adequacy" and "Professional Acceptance" ranged from at or above the "moderately concerned" level
- Classroom Management continued to be ranked high with a mean at the "moderately concerned level"
- Factors related to instructional materials also ranked high with a means just below the "moderately concerned" level
- "Acceptance by Students", as it relates to "Too Personal" with students, continued to be ranked last with a mean just below the "a little concerned" level

Reflection

Heightened concerns for impact are now equaled by concerns for Self near the "very concerned" level. Concerns for student motivation and academic-emotional-personal growth are met by equally high levels of concern for professional growth and adequacy. Task issues of classroom management and instructional materials continue to be strong concerns at the "moderately concerned" level.

- Distribution of moderate-very concerned factors across Self, Task and Impact
- Impact and Self factors ranked highest; these factors related professional growth and adequacy to motivating students and assuring their academic-personal-emotional growth near the "very concerned" level
- The Task factors of "Classroom Management" and "Instructional Materials" ranked as the next strongest at the "moderately concerned" level
- "Acceptance by Students", as it relates to issues with the adequacy of the curriculum, continued to be ranked last with a mean just below the "a little concerned" level

Professional Growth

Teachers' concerns for Self and Impact remain, but at reduced levels just above the "moderately concerned" level. Concern for professional growth is related to Impact concerns of student motivation and academic-emotional-personal growth. Although issues with instructional materials remain a concern, teachers' now identify non-instructional duties as a related concern in their teaching at the "moderate" level.

- Combined Self and Impact factors are the highest ranked concerns just above the "moderately concerned" level; these factors relate professional growth to motivating students and students' academic-emotional-personal growth
- "Non-Instructional Duties" emerged after being ranked last or low previously to combine with "Instructional Materials" as the third ranked factor with a mean just below the "moderately concerned" level
- Task concerns formed unique factor rankings just below the "moderately concerned" level in the following order: "Instructional Materials", "Classroom Management", "Pressure from Number of Students/Inflexibility of Situation"
- "Acceptance by Students", as it relates to issues with the school climate, continued to be ranked last with a mean below the "a little concerned" level

The Connection between Service and Impact

The results indicated that beginning teachers in this study consistently identified impact concerns (the most advanced developmental stage in Fuller's theory) as the highest ranking concern from pre-teaching through one and one-half years of teaching. One explanation for this result may be the nature of the M.Ed. programmatic model and the type student attracted to such a program. The application process requires applicants to write essays about their experiences and preparedness according to the three pillars of the program: professional development, community, spirituality. The program is explicit in it's connecting full-time teaching to service in the local school and community. The motto, "service through teaching" is taken seriously by the applicants and stands as central criteria for the selection of participants. Students accepted into the program have gained considerable experience in classrooms in a variety of teaching and volunteer work — 73.5% have completed a year or more of such work prior to (see Table 1). The expectation that a fundamental focus of the work of these beginning teachers should be focused on service to their students and the communities of the schools is established upon initial application and emphasized throughout the academic program. Future research might explore this connection further, examining entrance essays, teacher journals and comparative field-based programs.

The Teaching Task as Survival

One of the implications of these results for the supervision and preparation of teacher in this programmatic model is the recognition that task concerns emerge early and remain at a moderate level of concern throughout beginning teaching. In a sense, the description of beginning teaching as survival can be reinterpreted as an issue of teaching well and meeting the needs of students rather than that of self concerns as defined by Fullers and others. In particular, instructional materials (either a lack of or their inappropriateness) exceeded or was rated near the "moderately concerned" level at all six applications, often as two individual factors. This suggests a chronic problem in adapting existing materials and locating relevant materials to assist in instruction. Concrete steps may be taken in the academic program and supervision of teachers to focus on this issue to improve instruction. The second consistent concern was with classroom management. Although is was ranked as the highest concern in the pre-teaching stage, it's level of concern was quickly reduced as practicum, and then full-time, teaching began. This is understandable if it is the case that teachers quickly understand the relationship between student motivation and academic-emotional-personal growth (impact concerns) and classroom management. Disruptive or disrespectful students were not as great a concern as was meeting the needs of students both academically and emotionally in order to improve the classroom situation. Such advanced notions, characterized in the impact developmental stage, are important focal points for improved instruction for they seek to improve teaching, not the narrow scope of negative student behaviors.

Self as Professional Awareness

Concerns for self were initially reduced upon the first year of teaching. By the end of this first year, they reemerged as multiple factors between the "very concerned" to "moderately concerned" levels. The implications for a delayed focus on self concerns in this programmatic model are important for a number of reasons. First, this debunks the theory of a self-task-impact chronology. Self concerns seem to emerge once several months of full-time teaching have passed. Second, it suggests a delayed emergence of issues with professional development and adequacy — concerns that ultimately lead to reflection and interest in improved practice. From the perspective of supervision and programmatic development, the first year of teaching seems to consist of an intense experience with concerns for the task of teaching and impact on students that ultimately prepares teachers developmentally for reflection on professional development. It is possible that a contributor to this transition to self concerns of professional development is an increased intention to remain in education. Comparing the two cohorts in the middle of their first and second year of teaching, the second-year teachers indicate plans to stay in teaching or to remain in education at higher rates (see Table 10). The academic coursework and supervision might include an increased dimension on reflective practice, educational theory, action-research, and preparation

for the second year of teaching as components of the professional development across the two-year program.

Continued Research

This study is part of a longitudinal study that will follow the first-year cohort through two-years of beginning teaching and beyond. This will offer the opportunity to verify these findings. A comprehensive database will provide for future research on demographic variables, teacher journal entries and additional survey items relating to programmatic goals. This initial study marks the first work to establish a developmental sequence within a field-based teacher education program.

CONCLUSION: EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

The findings from the study are significant to both local and national audiences concerned with programmatic and policy issues in teacher education. This unique programmatic model is currently being replicated in eight institutions of higher education under the auspices of Notre Dame. As an alternative to traditional teacher education programs, this model provides the means for pairing educational coursework, teaching experience, and service for the preparation of teachers who have survived and passed through the initial stages of development. Continuing quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data will provide additional insights in terms of the effect of demographic, teaching context, and process variables on teacher development. The results will have implications for the sequencing and delivery of educational coursework and supervision of teachers within this programmatic model and directly challenges established notions of teacher development related to traditional teacher education models.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. D. (1982). A look at changes in teacher perceptions and behavior across time. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (4), 40-43.

Adams, R. D., Hutchinson, S., & Martray, C. (1980). A Developmental Study of Teacher Concerns across Time. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston (ERIC Document No. ED 189 181).

Berliner, D.C. (1988). Implications of studies in pedagogy for teacher education and evaluation. New Directions for Teacher Assessment. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bullough, R. V., (1990). Supervision, mentoring, and self-discovery: A case study of a first year teacher. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5, 338-360.

Burden, P. R. (1981). Teachers' Perceptions of Their Personal and Professional Development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Des Moines, IA. (ERIC Document No. ED 210 258).

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Dadlez, S. L. (1998). A Comparison of Secondary Professional Development School and Traditional Teacher Education Graduates: Analysis of Professional Concerns and Perceived Problems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of California, Riverside.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. (1971). Personalized Education for Teachers: An Introduction for Teacher Education. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document No. ED 048 105).

Fuller, F., & Bown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fuller, F., & Case, C. (1971). Concerns of Teachers: A Manual for Scoring the Teacher Concerns Statement. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin. (ERIC document No. 079 361).

Fuller, F., Parsons, J., & Watkins, J. E. (1974). Concerns of Teachers: Research and Reconceptualization. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin. (ERIC document No. 091 439).

George, A. A. (1978). Measuring Self, Task, and Impact Concerns: A Manual for Use on The Teacher Concerns Questionnaire. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin (ERIC document No. 175 845).

George, A. A., Borich, G. B. & Fuller, F. (1974). Progress Report on the Teacher Concern Checklist. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Griffin, G. A. (1989). Clinical teacher education. In J. V. Hoffman and S.A. Edwards (Eds.) Reality and Reform in Clinical Teacher Education. New York: Random House. p. 1-24.

Jacknicke, K. G., & Samiroden, W. G. (1990). Some perceptions of an internship program. Alberta Journal of Research, 37, 99-118.

Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62 (2), 129-169.

Katz, L. G. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. Elementary School Journal, 73, 50-55.

Kazelskis, R., & Reeves, C. K. (1987). Concern dimensions of preservice teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 11 (4), 45-52.

Lamanna, C. R. (1993). A Study of The Dimensions and The Developmental Progression of Teachers' Professional Concerns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lehiegh University.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed., pp. 527-568). New York: Macmillan.

McDonald, J., & Elias, P. (1980). The Problems of Beginning Teachers: A Crisis in Training. Princeton: Education Testing Service.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 26-29.

Reeves, C. K., & Kazelskis, R. (1985). Concerns of Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 78, 267-271.

Schipull, D. (1990). A Study of The Validity and Reliability of The Teacher Concerns Checklist. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Southern Mississippi.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54, 143-178.

Table 1. Demographic Variables between Cohorts.

	Cohort			
	First-Year Teachers		Second-Year Teachers	
n	82		76	
Age at Acceptance (mean)	22.7		21.1	
	f	%	f	%
Gender				
Female	43	52.4	39	51.3
Male	39	47.6	37	48.7
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0
Ethnicity[a]				
Asian	0	0	2	2.6
Black	1	1.2	3	3.9
Hispanic	5	6.1	4	5.3
White	74	90.2	65	85.5
Other	2	2.4	2	2.6
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0
Undergrad Major gpa				
< 2.50	1	1.2	0	0.0
2.50-2.74	0	0.0	2	2.6
2.75-2.99	2	2.4	7	9.2
3.00-3.24	11	13.4	15	19.7
3.25-3.49	32	39.0	26	34.2
3.50-3.74	23	28.0	18	23.7
3.75-4.00	13	15.9	8	10.5
Total	82	100.0	75	100.0
Yrs. Prior School Experience				
0	7	8.5	13	17.1
< 1	15	18.3	5	6.6
1	17	20.7	22	28.9
2	14	17.1	11	14.5
3	12	14.6	11	14.5
4	8	9.8	10	13.2
≥ 5	9	11.0	4	5.3
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0
Type of Prior School Experience				
Volunteer	51	62.2	36	47.4
Tutor	58	70.7	55	72.4
Before/After School	41	50.0	18	23.7
Classroom aide	21	25.6	13	17.1
Substitute teaching	10	12.2	13	17.1
Part-time teaching	7	8.5	5	6.6
Full-time teaching	3	3.7	5	6.6
Other	28	34.1	1	1.3

Total	*	*	*	*

Note. *Total exceeds 82 and 76 (f) and 100.0 (%) due to multiple answers.

[a]Based on categories used at the University of Notre Dame.

Table 2. Teaching Context Variables between Cohorts

	f	%	f	%
Grade(s) Taught				
Elementary 1-4	18	22.0	22	28.7
Middle School 5-8	41	50.0	38	50.0
High School 9-12	28	34.1	26	34.2
Total	*	*	*	*
School Location				
Urban	52	63.4	51	67.1
Rural	8	9.8	6	7.9
Suburban	22	26.8	19	25.0
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0
School Minority Percentage				
0-20%	30	36.6	29	38.2
21-40%	7	8.5	8	10.5
41-60%	5	6.1	5	6.6
61-80%	7	8.5	4	5.3
81-100%	33	40.2	30	39.5
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0

Note. *Total exceeds 82 and 76 (f) and 100.0 (%) due to multiple answers.

Table 3. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: First-Year Teachers at the Beginning of the First Summer Session

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)			
Factor Rank	1	2	3	4
Factor 3 – Classroom Management **[T]**	3.2560			
Factor 1 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal Growth **[I]**	3.1307			
Factor 4 – Performance Appraisal/Professional Acceptance **[S]**	3.1037			
Factor 5 – Professional Adequacy **[S]**	3.0221	3.0221		
Factor 8 – Instructional Materials **[T]**	3.0205	3.0205		
Factor 9 – Student Academic Range **[I]**	3.0061	3.0061		
Factor 2 – Student Personal-Academic Problems/Required Curriculum **[T]/[I]**	2.9610	2.9610	2.9610	
Factor 13 – School Policies **[T]**		2.5000	2.5000	2.5000
Factor 10 – Pressure from Number of Students and Inflexibility of Situation **[T]**		2.4751	2.4751	2.4751
Factor 6 – Student Acceptance **[S]**			2.3743	2.3743
Factor 11 – Student Personal Involvement/Rate of Teaching **[S]/[T]**				2.2744
Factor 7 – Student Personal-Emotional Problems/School Climate **[I]**				2.0396
Factor 12 – Non-Instructional Duties **[T]**				1.9634

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 4. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: First-Year Teachers at the End of the First Summer Session

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)		
Factor Rank	1	2	3
Factor 1 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.1515		
Factor 6 – Student Academic Range **[I]**	3.0981		
Factor 7 – Instructional Materials/Diagnosing Student Learning Problems **[T]/[I]**	3.0981		
Factor 9 – Lack of Instructional Materials **[T]**	2.8228	2.8228	
Factor 5 – Pressure of Student Personal Involvement Inflexibility of Teaching **[S]/[T]**	2.7453	2.7453	2.7453
Factor 3 – Professional Freedom/Instructional Materials **[S]/[T]**	2.6156	2.6156	2.6156
Factor 2 – Classroom Management/Student and Professional Acceptance **[S]/[T]**	2.5949	2.5949	2.5949
Factor 10 – Student Sexuality and Drug Problems **[I]**	2.5823	2.5823	2.5823
Factor 4 – Rate of Teaching/School Policies **[T]**		2.4399	2.4399
Factor 8 – Pressure and from Number of Students and Non-Instructional Duties **[T]**			2.1856

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 5. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: First-Year Teachers at the Middle of their First Year of Teaching

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)					
Factor Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6
Factor 3 – Student Academic Range **[I]**	3.4741					
Factor 1 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal Growth **[I]**	3.4190	3.4190				
Factor 9 – Instructional Materials **[T]**	3.2346	3.2346	3.2346			
Factor 5 – Classroom Management **[T]**	2.9796	2.9796	2.9796			
Factor 8 – Student Sexuality and Drug Problems/Learning Problems **[I]**	2.8317	2.8317	2.8317	2.8317		
Factor 12 – Lack of Instructional Materials **[T]**		2.7901	2.7901	2.7901		
Factor 7 –Pressure-Professional Adequacy/Rate of Instruction **[S]/[T]**			2.7315	2.7315	2.7315	
Factor 10 – Professional Growth/School Policies **[S]/[T]**			2.6605	2.6605	2.6605	2.6605
Factor 13 – Non-Instructional Duties **[T]**				2.2963	2.2963	2.2963
Factor 11 – Number of Students **[T]**				2.2222	2.2222	2.2222
Factor 4 – Student Personal Interest/Performance Appraisal **[S]**				2.2148	2.2148	2.2148
Factor 6 – Professional Freedom **[S]**					2.0946	2.0946
Factor 2 – Student Acceptance/Performance Appraisal **[S]**						2.0046

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 6. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: Second-Year Teachers at the Beginning of the Second Summer Session

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)				
Factor Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Factor 1 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.6101				
Factor 12 – Diagnosing Student Learning Problems **[I]**	3.5556				
Factor 11 – Professional Adequacy **[S]**	3.2361	3.2361			
Factor 2 – Classroom Management-Professional Acceptance **[S]/[T]**	2.9806	2.9806	2.9806		
Factor 13 – Lack of Instructional Materials **[T]**		2.7500	2.7500	2.7500	
Factor 6 – Performance Appraisal **[S]**		2.7228	2.7228	2.7228	
Factor 9 – Drugs and Sexuality **[I]**		2.6667	2.6667	2.6667	
Factor 3 – Professional Freedom-Instructional Materials **[T]**		2.6111	2.6111	2.6111	2.6111
Factor 4 – Pressure from Number of Students and Rate of Teaching **[T]**		2.6007	2.6007	2.6007	2.6007
Factor 10 – Non-Instructional Duties **[T]**			2.3611	2.3611	2.3611
Factor 5 – Student Acceptance/School Policies **[S]**			2.3056	2.3056	2.3056
Factor 7 – Student diversity and Personal Problems **[I]**				2.2066	2.2066
Factor 8 – Student Acceptance/Too Personal **[S]**					1.9168

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 7. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: Second-Year Teachers at the End of the Second Summer Session

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)			
Factor Rank	1	2	3	4
Factor 1 – Student Motivation-Academic/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.6955			
Factor 2 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.5124			
Factor 12 - Professional Adequacy **[S]**	3.3682			
Factor 4 – Classroom Management **[T]**	3.1093	3.1093		
Factor 11 – Instructional Materials **[T]**	3.0299	3.0299	3.0299	
Factor 3 – Performance Appraisal **[S]**		2.6194	2.6194	2.6194
Factor 9 – Student Personal Problems **[I]**		2.5896	2.5896	2.5896
Factor 6 – School Policies **[T]**			2.4216	2.4216
Factor 8 – Pressure from Number of Students and Rate of Instruction **[T]**				2.3528
Factor 5 – Student Personal Problems and Involvement/Non-Instructional Duties **[S]/[T]**				2.3418
Factor 10 – Professional Freedom**[T]**				2.1194
Factor 7 – Student Acceptance/Curriculum **[S]/[T]**				2.0793

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 8. Unique Sub-Sets of Factors by Rank and Significant Differences between Means: Second-Year Teachers at the Middle of the Second Year of Teaching

	Subsets by Factor Means (alpha = .05)					
Factor Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6
Factor 2 – Student Motivation-Academic/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.2447					
Factor 1 – Student Academic-Emotional-Personal/Professional Growth **[S/I]**	3.2258					
Factor 7 – Non-Instructional Duties/Instructional Materials **[T]**	2.9076	2.9076				
Factor 6 – Professional Freedom/Instructional Materials **[S]/[T]**	2.6414	2.6414	2.6414			
Factor 4 – Classroom Management **[T]**		2.5617	2.5617	2.5617		
Factor 5 – Pressure from Number of Students and Inflexibility of Situation **[T]**		2.3763	2.3763	2.3763	2.3763	
Factor 10 – Drugs, Sexuality and Absenteeism **[I]**			2.3026	2.3026	2.3026	2.3026
Factor 9 – School Policies **[T]**			2.0987	2.0987	2.0987	2.0987
Factor 8 – Student Personal Interest/Performance Appraisal **[S]**				2.0182	2.0182	2.0182
Factor 11 – Student Personal Involvement and Principal Appraisal **[S]**					1.8553	1.8553
Factor 3 – Student Acceptance/School Climate **[S]/[T]**						1.7395

Note. [I] denotes factor related to concerns of Impact, [T] Task and [S] Self.

Means are representative of the following scale: 1 – not concerned; 2 – a little concerned; 3 – moderately concerned; 4 – very concerned; 5 – extremely concerned.

Table 9. Chronology of Stages Over 1.5 Years of Beginning Teaching: Number of Factors Rated at the Moderately-Very Concerned Levels

	Time Frame				
Stage	Beginning of First Summer Session	End of First Summer Session	Middle of First Year of Teaching	End of First Year of Teaching	En Second Ses
Self Concerns	2	1	0	3	
Task Concerns	2	1	2	1	
Impact Concerns	2	3	2	2	
Total	6	5	4	6	

Table 10. Teachers' Post-Graduate Occupational Plans: Middle of First-Year of Teaching (First-Year Cohort) and Second-Year of Teaching (Second-Year Cohort)

	Cohort			
	First-Year Teachers		Second-Year Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Upon graduation, I plan to...				
Teach (or administrate) at my current school	5	6.1	8	10.5
Teach (or administrate) at a different Catholic school	10	12.2	16	21.1
Teach in a non-Catholic school	2	2.4	4	5.3
Teach, but do not know where	16	19.5	12	15.8
Sub-total	33	40.2	40	52.7
Remaining in education, but not as a teacher	3	3.7	4	5.3
Enroll in graduate school in education	2	2.4	2	2.6
Sub-total	5	6.1	6	7.9
Enroll in graduate school other than education	14	17.1	14	18.4
Work for a non-profit organization	3	3.7	3	3.9
Seek employment outside of education/non-profits	3	3.7	2	2.6
Enter a religious vocation	1	1.2	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	1	1.3
Sub-total	21	25.7	20	26.2
I have no plans	23	28.0	10	13.2
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0
If remaining in teaching, I plan on remaining in education...				
As my life career	20	24.4	12	15.8
As long as family/financial conditions allow	12	14.6	18	23.7
Short term while seeking other employment or educational opportunities	2	2.4	9	11.8
Leaving education, but do not know at what time	4	4.9	5	6.6
Other	2	2.4	2	2.6
Not applicable	42	51.2	30	39.5
Total	82	100.0	76	100.0

Note. Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding.

Figure 1. Teacher Developmental Concerns Stages Theory (Fuller, 1978)

"Concern" defined – *a perceived problem or aspect of teaching a teacher thinks about frequently and would like to do something about in his/her practice (George, 1978)*

SELF – concerns which characterize beginning teachers; concerns focused on the individual teacher (self) or aspects of teaching that reflect on the abilities of the teacher to perform, such as survival in the classroom, receiving a good evaluation by peers and administrators, feelings of adequacy as a teacher, and acceptance by other teachers.

TASK – concerns which emerge as self concerns are resolved; concerns about the teaching situation or teaching task that may interfere with performance, such as the number of students to be taught, lack of instructional materials, and the large number of non-teaching duties to be done.

IMPACT – concerns which emerge as task concerns are resolved; concerns about the impact of teaching on students and aspects of teaching that relate to the social, emotional and educational well-being of students, such as guiding, challenging, and meeting the needs of diverse students and adapting teaching methods to meet these needs.

(Fuller, 1969; Dadlez, 1998)

Figure 1. Chronology of Factor Characteristics across One and One-Half Years of Beginning Teaching

Pre-Teaching (entry into Program)
Teachers' indicate moderate concerns related to self, task and impact. They are most concerned with classroom management and instructional materials, the academic range and personal growth of students, and professional adequacy and acceptance.

POST PRACTIcum (end of 1st summer session)
Teachers' indicate moderate concerns related to impact: student academic range and academic, personal and emotional growth. Embedded within these impact concerns are issues of professional growth (self) and instructional materials (task).

Initiation to Teaching (middle of 1st school year)
Teachers' strongest concerns become more focused on impact and task. Concerns related to self drop below the "moderately concerned" level. They show heightened concern, well above the "moderately concerned" level, for student academic range and the academic-personal-emotional growth of students. Additionally, there are moderate concerns for inadequate instructional materials and classroom management.

Professionalization (end of 1st year)
Impact concerns, such as student learning problems and student academic-emotional-personal growth, rise higher towards the "very concerned" level. However, teachers also indicate many concerns with the self issues of professional growth, adequacy and acceptance at or above the "moderately concerned" level. Classroom management continues to be a moderate task concern.

Reflection (end of 2nd summer session
Heightened concerns for impact are now equaled by concerns for self near the "very concerned" level. Concerns for student motivation and academic-emotional-personal growth are met by equally high levels of concern for professional growth and adequacy. Task concerns for classroom management and instructional materials continue to be strong concerns at the "moderately concerned" level.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (MIDDLE OF 2ND SCHOOL YEAR)
Teachers' concerns for self and impact remain, but at reduced levels just above the "moderately concerned" level. Concern for professional growth is embedded into impact concerns for student motivation and academic-emotional-personal growth. Although issues with instructional materials remain a concern, teachers' now identify non-instructional duties as a related concern in their teaching at the "moderate" level.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Study of Stages of Beginning Teacher Development in a Field-Based Teacher Education Program	
Author(s): Watzke, John L.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 04/05/2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: John Watzke	Printed Name/Position/Title: John L. Watzke, Ass. Prof.	
Organization/Address: ACE-112 Badin Hall / 46556 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN	Telephone: 574-631-9387	FAX: 574-631-7939
	E-Mail Address: jwatzke@nd.edu	Date: 04/22/2002

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: